The Examiner suggests that Groups I and II as set forth above are distinct, each from the other, because they are related as product and process of use. The Examiner further suggests that the search required for Group I is not coextensive with the search required for Group II. The Examiner has yet further suggested that Claims 1-20 are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species comprising different molecules. The species of the molecules are suggested to be identified by specific SEQ ID Nos., as listed in claim 3. Applicants respectfully traverse this restriction requirement.

At the outset, claim 1 has been amended and claim 3 has been canceled to clarify that the claimed invention is an antisense compound targeted to a single disclosed species of Interferon gamma receptor 2, namely, SEQ ID NO: 3. Support for this amendment is found throughout the specification and at page 80, line 29. Applicants believe that these amendments satisfy the species election requirement.

The criteria which must be met for a restriction requirement to be proper are set forth in MPEP §803 and include: (1) that the inventions be independent or distinct and (2) that there would be a serious burden on the Examiner if the restriction is not required. MPEP 802.01 defines "distinct" to mean that the "two or

more subjects as disclosed are related, for example, as combination and part (subcombination) thereof, process and apparatus for its practice, process and product made there, etc., but are capable of separate manufacture, use, or sale, as claimed, AND ARE PATENTABLE (novel and unobvious) OVER EACH OTHER."

Clearly, Groups I and II, both contain claims with the same elements or technical features, namely, a compound 8 to 50 nucleobases in length targeted to a nucleic acid molecule encoding human Interferon gamma receptor 2 (SEQ ID NO 3). Accordingly these groups do not meet the definition of distinct.

Further, there would be no a burden on the Examiner due to additional searching, if the restriction is not made. Clearly any search performed to the identify art relating to the compound would identify any relevant art to methods of using the compound.

Accordingly, since the instant restriction requirement fails to meet either of the two criteria for proper restriction, reconsideration and withdrawal of this Restriction Requirement is respectfully requested.

In an earnest effort to be completely responsive, however, Applicants elect to prosecute Group I, claims 1-2 and 4-14, with traverse.

Attached hereto is a marked up version of the changes made to the claims by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned "Version with Markings to Show Changes Made".

Respectfully submitted,

Jane Massey Licata
Registration No. 32,257

Date: **August 1, 2002**

Licata & Tyrrell P.C.
66 E. Main Street
Marlton, New Jersey 08053

(856) 810-1515

Version with Markings to Show Changes Made

1. (Amended) A compound 8 to 50 nucleobases in length targeted to a nucleic acid molecule encoding human Interferon gamma receptor 2 (SEQ ID NO: 3), wherein said compound specifically hybridizes with and inhibits the expression of human Interferon gamma receptor 2.